

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 14-16, 18, 19, and 22-49 are pending. Claim 50 is added. Claims 1, 3, 28, and 29 are amended by this Amendment. Claims 1 and 28 are amended to clarify the claimed invention as discussed with the Examiner. Claims 3 and 29 are amended to place these claims into independent form. Claim 50 is added to claim subject matter to which the Applicant is entitled. No new matter is added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Interview. During the Interview, Applicant and Examiner discussed the term "link relationship." Applicant described the claim invention and distinguished the claimed invention from the cited prior art of record. Applicant proposed various claim amendments. Examiner agreed to discuss these amendments with his supervisor.

With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-13, 16-22, 24-26 and 28-32 as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671 to Goerz, Jr. et al. (Goerz) in view of Teach Yourself XML, Sandra E. Eddy, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA 1999 (Eddy), Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Neither Eddy nor Goerz (alone or in combination) teach or suggest the steps of independent claims 1 and 28. For example, neither reference teaches or suggest "using a unique identifier to retrieve the link relationships, wherein unique identifiers indicate locations of document objects on the network." As discussed during the Interview, Goerz teaches returning URLs from key word search. Goerz does not teach or suggest using a URL to retrieve a link relationship. Eddy does not cure this defect.

Likewise, neither Eddy nor Goerz (alone or in combination) teach or suggest "wherein the one or more link directories are separate from the document objects." Goerz does not teach or suggest link directories, let alone that link directories are separate from the document objects. Eddy does not cure this defect.

Consequently, claims 1 and 28 are allowable over the art of record. Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 15-21, 24, 25, 27, and 30-49 are allowable for the same reasons and the independent features they recite.

Eddy and Goerz (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest all of the steps of independent claim 29. For example, Eddy and Goerz do not teach or suggest:

assigning one or more link relationship attributes to each link relationship, wherein the one or more assigned link relationship attributes describe the link relationship as determined by a user assigning the link relationship attributes; and storing the link relationships with the attributes in the one or more link directories located on the network..

Likewise, Eddy and Goerz do not teach or suggest “using a unique identifier to retrieve the link relationships, wherein unique identifiers indicate locations of document objects on the network,” as recited in claim 29. For at least these reasons, claim 29 is allowable.

Eddy and Goerz (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest all of the steps of new independent claim 50. For example, Eddy and Goerz do not teach or suggest “wherein the one or more link relationships are separate from the document objects,” as in claim 1 above. Likewise, Eddy and Goerz fail to teach or suggest “storing the link relationships with the attributes in the one or more link directories located on the network,” as in claim 29 above. For at least these reasons, claim 50 is allowable.

Claims 3, 5, 14, 15, 23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Eddy and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 to LeMole et al (“LeMole”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Goerz, Eddy and LeMole fail to teach or suggest all of the steps of independent claim 3. For example, Goerz, Eddy, and LeMole fail to teach or suggest “creating one or more user profiles, wherein the one or more user profiles specify one or more link directories and one or more attributes relevant to the user’s interest.” LeMole fails to disclose link directories, let alone a user profile specifying a link directory or attributes relevant to the user interest. LeMole does not teach or suggest a profile containing both link directories and attributes or attributes of link relationships. Likewise, the cited section of LeMole does not teach each and every step of the managing step. Further, Goerz, Eddy, and LeMole do not teach or suggest “using a unique identifier to retrieve the link relationships, wherein unique identifiers indicate locations of document objects on the network,” as discussed above. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable for at least these reasons. Dependent claims 5, 14, 15, 23 and 27 are allowable for at least these reasons and the independent features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **November 10, 2005**


Sean S. Wooden, Reg. No.: 43,997

Andrews Kurth LLP

1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

Tel. (202) 662-2738

Fax (202) 662-2739